

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PAIFN IS AND TRADEMARKS PO BOS 1450 Alexandra, Vugnia 22/13-(150 www.usptc.gov

APPLICATION NO	FIEING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
(19:945,484	08/30/2001	Harald Hundt	P99,0252-01	6191	
L6574	7590 05/28/2003				
SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE 6600 SEARS TOWER 233 S WACKER DR			EXAMINER		
			MEEKS TIMOTHY HOWARD		
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1762		
			DATE MAILED: 05/28/2003	DATE MAILED: 05/28/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/945,484	HUNDT, HARALD
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Timothy H. Meeks	1762
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication approximation ap	opears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION misions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reduced for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1 704(b)	. 136(a). In no event, however, may a possible that the statutory minimum of third d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tale, cause the application to become Af	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely ITHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
2a)□		This action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under		
Dispositi	on of Claims		
4)[•	Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application	٦.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊡	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.	
Applicati	ion Papers		
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.	
10)[•	The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 August 2001</u> is/are	:: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ object	cted to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to		
11) 🗌	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)☐ approved b)☐ d	disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in	•	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner.	
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume		
	Ones of the part field capies of the prication from the international E see the attached detailed Office action to a management	Bureau (PCT Ruie 1. 2(a).	
14)[] <i>F</i>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	stic priority under 35 U.S.C	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
	$oxed{0} igcap The translation of the foreign language oldsymbol{p} Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome$		
Attachmen	ot(s)		
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO 415) Paper Nets) informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
U.S. Patent and T	rademar• O# ce		

Application/Control Number: 09/945,484

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/242,590, filed on 19 February 1999. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 07-211530 in view of Humphrey et al. (5,201,956).

JP '530 discloses a process comprising depositing parylene polymers on a tape wound core from the vapor phase (English translation at pages 6-7). Tape of amorphous alloy is disclosed at page 9 of the English translation.

JP '530 is silent as to the specific parylene vapor phase coating method used and therefore fails to disclose deposition in a rotating drum under vacuum. However, because Humphrey discloses that such drum coating wherein parlyene dimer is vaporized, cracked to form monomer, and the monomer vapor introduced into the rotating drum, condensed on the

or and the continuence of the continuence of the continuence of the continuence of the continuence of

simultaneously under vacuum (figures 1 and 2, col. 1, line 40 to col. 2, line 35), and as coating a plurality of the cores at once would have the obvious advantage of increased throughput, it

Application/Control Number: 09/945,484

Art Unit: 1762

would have been obvious to have used the drum coating process to coat parylene onto the tape wound cores to allow for increased process throughput.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '530 in view Humphrey et al. as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Hatch (4,960,050).

The teachings of the primary references are cited above. It is further noted that Humphrey discloses at col. 4, lines 60-68 that the dimer is vaporized at typical pressures used in the process and at temperatures of 80-200 C and at col. 5, lines 5-10 that the dimer is pyrolyzed at typical pressures used in the parylene process and temperatures of 650-750 C. The range of temperatures for these steps overlap with the ranges for temperature in claim 4. It would have been obvious to select the overlapping values in the ranges with a reasonable expectation of their being operable and successful. With respect to pressure, Hatch discloses at col. 6, lines 5-15 that the parylene dimer is generally vaporized at 0.1 to 1 Torr and pyrolyzed at a slightly lower pressure. Therefore, use of the claimed pressures for these steps would have been obvious with a reasonable expectation of their being operable and successful.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy H. Meeks whose telephone number is (703) 308-3816. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Tues., Thurs.(6-6:30), Fri.(6:30-10:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's expervisor. Shrive P. Beek can be reached on [7/3] 3/48 (2000) P. Chax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (7/03) 872-9310 for regular communications and (7/03) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/945,484 Page 4 Art Unit: 1762 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661. Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762 nf May 27, 2003